Attorney Docket No.: 100021-00142

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-7 are currently pending. No amendment has been made to the claims.

In the Office Action mailed April 5, 2007, the abstract has been objected to because of informalities, and claims 107 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0236755 to Dagelet Jr. ("Dagelet").

Applicants have amended the Abstract to be in proper form according to MPEP §608.01(b) in reply to the objection thereof. As to the rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Applicants hereby traverse the rejection as follows.

The POS system of claim 1 includes a server and a client, comprising a first master file formed in a relational data base format and used during an online session between the server and the client, and a second master file formed in a text format, having a capacity smaller than the first master file, and used during an offline session between the server and the client, the second master file being down loaded from the server to the client at a time when it is necessary for the client. The client of the POS system of claim 1 comprises a first referring means referring the first master file; and a second referring means referring the second master file, the referring means being switched in such a way that, during an online session, the first master file being referred by the first referring means, and during an offline session, the second master file being referred to by the second referring means.

Claim 1 renders a POS system that provides an offline master file referring system, in which during an online session (i.e. a normal operation period) between the server and the client, the operation is carried out by referring to a file of a RDB

. .

Attorney Docket No.: 100021-00142

(relational data base) type on the server, and during an offline session, a text format file previously downloaded from the server to the client is used. According to the present invention, a normal PLU (price look up) can be carried out without stopping the registering operating even during the offline session. See paragraph [0008] of the specification.

Dagelet, on the other hand, relates to a POS system for providing prepaid services, not POS system for providing online/offline transactions. The Examiner asserted that Dagelet discloses, in paragraphs [0012] and [0051], a second master file formed in a text format, having capacity smaller than the first master file, and used during an offline session between the server and the client, as recited in Claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagreed.

As described in paragraphs [0012]-[0015], Dagelet provides a POS system for distributing prepaid services to customers without the need or use of tangible prepaid cards and to provide an improved system for the management and distribution of prepaid card values to customers without discarding existing physical pre-paid cards, thereby avoiding the ideological wastage associated with the present practice. Dagelet also provides a system of increasing the available balance of an existing tangible prepaid card without buying or printing a new prepaid card, provides services on a variety of services and goods on a single account with capabilities of settling each account when desired, and provides prepaid services on new services or goods to customers without the need of new reprogramming or reinitialization of existing POS terminals, thereby preventing the cost and expenses associated with collecting, upgrading and redistributing POS terminals. Apparently, Dagelet focuses on a POS system for providing prepaid services, not a POS system as claimed in Claim 1. As

Attorney Docket No.: 100021-00142

such, Dagelet disclose a very different concept from the subject matter of Claim 1 of the

present invention.

Furthermore, according to paragraph [0051], Dagelet describes that on a periodic

frequency, usually minutes at a time, the database is replicated and backed up for

reference and contingency measures. Thus, if the Host Server 1 fails, the Web Servers

3 may be used for the continuance of the system operations. The back up data

described in Dagelet, however, is not used off-lined, as is the second master file recited

in Claim 1.

Dagelet also does not teach or suggest a second master file formed in a text

format. The text format of the Applicants' claimed invention has the advantage of

superior in searching ability to a binary format. The text format is also superior in size to

the binary format and has a simple data format to be easily used in various applications

or in a database. As Dagelet does not disclose a second master file formed in text

format, and thus does not provide at least same advantages as Applicants' claimed

invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Dagelet does not disclose at least a

second master file formed in a text format, having capacity smaller than the first master

file, and used during an offline session between the server and the client, as recited in

Claim 1 and thus, Claim 1 is not anticipated by Dagelet under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and is

patentable over Dagelet.

Applicants also respectfully submit that Claims 2-7 are not anticipated over

Dagelet at least due to their dependency from patentable Claim 1.

TECH/515479.2

5

Attorney Docket No.: 100021-00142

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of claims 1-7, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300 referencing docket number 100021-00142.

Respectfully submitted,

Wan-Ching Y. Montfort

Registration Number 56,127

Customer No. 004372 ARENT FOX LLP 1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400 Washington, D.C. 20036-5339

Tel: (202) 857-6000

Fax: (202) 638-4810